REMARKS

By the non-final *Office Action* of 29 April 2005, Claims 1-24 are pending in this Application, with Claims 1-11, 13-21, and 22-24 being rejected. The Examiner objected to Claim 12, but indicated that Claim 12 recites allowable subject matter. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claim 12 recites allowable subject matter. In addition, the Examiner objected Claims 1, 5, and 16.

By the present *Response and Amendment*, Applicant amends Claims 1, 13, and 22 to clarify Applicant's claimed invention, and cancels claims 5 and 11-12. Applicant amends Claims 1, 13, and 22 solely to facilitate prosecution and reserves the right to submit broader claims or claims having similar scope as originally filed in a continuation application. Applicant also amends Claims 1 and 16 as suggested by the Examiner to overcome claim objections. Upon entry of this *Response and Amendment*, Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 13-24 are pending.

Applicant files this *Response and Amendment* in an effort to move this case to allowance and to revive this case. No new matter is believed introduced by the present *Response and Amendment*. Applicant respectfully submits that the present Application is in condition for allowance for the following reasons.

1. Petition For Revival Of An Application For Patent Abandoned Unintentionally Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b)

Applicant submits herewith a petition to revive the present Application. Applicant also submits herewith the required petition fee, this response to the 29 April 2005 Office Action, and a statement that the entire delay was unintentional. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the revival petition is in condition for being granted and that upon review of this response that the present Application is in condition for allowance.

2. Docket Number and Change in Correspondence Address

Applicant respectfully requests the docket number of this Application be changed from 081607-1170 to STAT1170. This Application has been transferred to a new law firm (Troutman Sanders LLP), and its docketing procedures utilize this new docket number. A *Request to Withdrawal as Attorney* was filed on 5 October 2004 transferring this Application to the new firm. This request was granted in a 14 February 2005 decision. Applicant submits herewith A

Revocation and Appointment of Power of Attorney and a Change of Correspondence Address to perfect this change in counsel and to authorize practitioners associated with Customer No. 006980 to prosecute this Application.

3. Information Disclosure Statement Submission

Applicant contemporaneously files an information disclosure statement ("IDS") submission with this response. The IDS submission contains both electronic and paper submissions. The required IDS fee will be provided with the paper portion of the IDS submission. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to review the IDS submission (electronic and paper portions) when reviewing this response.

4. The Pending Claims

Applicant amends independent Claims 1, 13, and 22 to clarify Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant amends these claims to include subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner in the *Office Action* (See page 8 in *Office Action*). Thus, Applicant believes that Claims 1, 13, and 22, and their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance because they now contain subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner.

5. The Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to the language of Claims 1, 5, and 16. The Examiner also suggested language changes to over come these objections. Applicant thanks the Examiner for suggesting these changes to overcome the objections. Applicant amends Claims 1 and 16 to contain these changes and cancels Claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objections to Claims 1 and 16.

6. The Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-11, 13-21, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of several references. These references include U.S. Patent Numbers 5,907,491 (Canada et al.); 5,892,690 (Boatman et al.); 6,400,819 (Nakano et al.); and 6,678,255 (Kuriyan). In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the subject matter recited in originally filed Claim 12 is allowable over these cited references.

In response to the *Office Action*, Applicant amends independent Claims 1, 13, and 22 to recite the subject matter deemed allowable by the Examiner. Applicant, therefore, respectfully asserts that the claim rejections have been overcome thus obviating the necessity to specifically respond to the cited references, which Applicant believes fail to satisfy a prima facie case of obviousness as required in MPEP § 2143. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 13, and 22, and their respective dependent claims are now in condition for allowance.

7. Fees

Applicant believes no claims fees are due, as the total number of Claims, and independent Claims, is equal to or less than the number of Claims paid for upon filing this Application.

This *Response and Amendment* is being filed with a 37 CFR § 1.137(b) revival petition. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the small-entity, revival petition fee (\$750) to Deposit Account No. 20-1507. No other fees are believed due. Authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 20-1507, however, is given should additional fees be due.

CONCLUSION

By the present Response and Amendment with Revival Petition Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), the Application has been in placed in full condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests early and favorable action. Should the Examiner have any questions or reservations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned Attorney, Hunter Yancey, at 404.885.3696.

Respectfully submitted,

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP

James Hunt Hunter Vancey, Jr.

USPTO Reg. No. 53,800

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP Bank of America Plaza 600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200 Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216 United States

P: 404.885.3696 F: 404.962.6828

E: hunter.yancey@troutmansanders.com

DATE: 16 DECEMBER 2005